Approved For Release 2001/11/01 CART P76-00183R000300090141-8

DIARY NOTES

25X1A

DD/S

24 February 1961

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

1. Sherman Kent telephoned to apologize for any inconvenience that Admiral may have caused us because he did not show up for our briefing. I assured him that it had been no inconvenience at all and that he could forget the whole matter as far as we were concerned.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

has reported to that in his opinion we could merge the Fiscal and Finance Divisions if we put everything under confidential funds, thereby saving a minimum of six to ten people. (It is probable that we could save even more.) I have asked Charlie to draft a brief memorandum to the Director along these lines.



- - 4. I asked Dr. Tietjen to give some thought to the possibility of briefing the Director or General Cabell semiannually concerning the health of our senior people. I'm not sure that this is a good idea, but I was impressed with the amount of information which Shef Edwards was able to present in about an hour and a half concerning some sixty people. It might be a good service for the Doctor to render in the medical field. I'm not sure of this, however, and, of course, there is the question of maintaining the doctor/patient relationship on a strictly confidential basis unless there is a good reason for advising the Director of something which is more vital to the Agency.
 - 5. I also discussed with John Tietjen at some length, without coming to any definite conclusion, the philosophy of sending overseas those dependents who are likely to become burdens on our stations. At the moment, unless a case is an extreme one the Medical Staff does not disqualify a dependent from going overseas; in fact, technically, it doesn't disqualify even that kind. What it does is to advise the Division Chief very strongly that an individual should not go. The second method of preventing people from going overseas who should not is to place the responsibility on the employees, who, after all, should have the welfare of their dependents foremost in their minds. I'm not sure that this is right, however, because an employee, if he really wants to go, can

Approved For Release 2001/11/03 DP76-00183R000300090141-8

rationalize taking a dependent along with him even though he or she may become a burden. In fact, I know of quite a few employees who would rather have their dependents overseas if they need medical attention simply because such care is free. The third method is for the Division Chief or other command channel to say that he will not send a person overseas because of his dependents. At the moment this is all a little fuzzy, and I'm not sure that we are operating in the best interests of the Agency. In fact, I saw one or two dependents on my recent trip who certainly are burdens on the station out of all proportion to the worth of the employees. (I want to follow up on this at a later date and see just what we should do about it, if anything.)

6. Larry Houston advised me that he objected to the request made by the Development Projects Division to pay certain individuals

diem. The paper has, therefore, been withdrawn by DPD and is working with the Division to try to accomplish its objective in some way that will not be objectionable from a legal point of view. I sent a note on this suggesting that it would have been much better and saved a lot of time if he would have taken the trouble to consult with us before writing the paper, getting Dick Bissell's signature, etc.

7. reported that it looked as though we were going to be able to supply Ken Sprankle of the House Appropriations Committee Staff with one stenographer-typist

(male). This is not final, however, and I will expect to hear from Dan when it is.

